RECEIVED FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

1 2	FEDE	CRAL ELECTION COMMISSION 999 E Street, N.W.	N 2013 FEB 13	AH 11: 24
3	SENSITIVE	Washington, D.C. 20463	CEL	_A
4	FIRST	GENERAL COUNSEL'S REPO	RT .	
5 6 7	Pre-MUR 542 DATE RECEIVED: June 7, 2012 DATE ACTIVATED: July 16, 2012			
8 9 10 11		EXPIRATION ( Earliest: Ap Latest: July	ril 14, 2007	
12	SQURCE:	Sua Sponte Subj	nission	
13 14 15 16	RESPONDENT:	AFL-CIO, C Education ar	ngshoremen's As committee on Poli nd Harold Dagget city as treasurer	itical
17 18 19	RELEVANT STATUTE AND REGULATION:	2 U.S.C. § 434(1 11 C.F.R. § 104		
20	INTERNAL REPORTS CHEC	CKED: Disclosure Repo	ortș	FEDER CO SEC 2013 FEB
21	FEDERAL AGENCIES CHEC	CKED: None		RECEI DERALE COMMIS SECRET
22	I. INTRODUCTION			VED LECTION ARIAT PM 4:
23	The International Longsh	oremen's Association, AFL-CIO, C	ommittee on Poli	tical
24	Education and Harold Daggett in	his official capacity as treasurer ("l	LA-COPE") noti	fied the
25	Federal Election Commission (th	e "Commission") under the Commi	ssion's <i>sua spont</i>	e policy
26	that it had not accurately disclosed financial activity totaling about \$1.8 million over a ten-year			
27	period. In particular, as it explain	ined in an audit findings report supp	olementing its sub	omission,

See ILA-COPE Sua Sponte Submission (Jun. 7, 2012) (referencing Policy Regarding Self-Reporting of Campaign Finance Violations (Sua Sponte Submissions), 72 Fed. Reg. 16,695 (Apr. 5, 2007) ("Sua Sponte Policy")); ILA-COPE Supp. Sua Sponte Submission at 19 (Oct. 30, 2012) ("Audit Findings").

- between 2005 and 2011, ILA-COPE under-reported disbursements by \$1,338,675.57 and
- 2 receipts by \$491,800.40.2 It also failed to report or keep records for independent expenditures it
- made in 2008 totaling \$130,414.26.3 ILA-COPE concluded that this misreporting resulted from
- 4 poor recordkeeping and communication as well as its staff members' general lack of knowledge
- 5 regarding Commission reporting requirements.<sup>4</sup>
- Based on the available information, the Office of the General Counsel ("OGC") has
- 7 concluded that ILA-COPE violated 2 U.S.C. § 434(b) and (g) by failing to accurately disclose
- 8 receipts, dishursements, cash on hand, and independent expenditures in its reports to the
- 9 Commission. Because the issues are clear and well documented—based in part on ILA-COPE's
- substantial candor and cooperation in self-disclosing and thoroughly documenting its
- violations—we pursued this matter through Fast-Track Resolution.<sup>5</sup> Having completed
- 12 negotiations with ILA-COPE, we now recommend that the Commission open a Matter Under
- 13 Review, accept the attached executed Conciliation Agreement, and close the file in this matter.

#### 14 II. FACTUAL SUMMARY

- 15 ILA-COPE is a separate segregated fund ("SSF") that first registered with the
- 16 Commission in 1982. For more than a decade, ILA-COPE has used outside accounting and
- 17 compliance firms to assist with its financial management and Commission disclosure obligations.

See Audit Findings at 6. The Audit Findings provide the results of an invastigation conducted by ILA-COPE's outside compliance consultant.

*Id*. at 16.

*Id*. at 2.

See Sua Sponte Policy, 72 Fed. Reg. at 16,698.

<sup>6</sup> Audit Findings at 4.

- 1 Its longtime outside accounting firm is Joseph L. Gil, CPA, P.C. From approximately October
- 2 2002 to December 2011, ILA-COPE's outside compliance consultant was Brand Law Group.<sup>8</sup>
- 3 On February 12, 2012, ILA-COPE replaced Brand Law Group with PAC Outsourcing LLC.9
- 4 During the transition, PAC Outsourcing identified discrepancies between ILA-COPE's
- 5 bank statements and the cash on hand it reported to the Commission. 10 After learning of the
- 6 discrepancies, ILA-COPE instructed its new compliance firm to conduct un audit covering all of
- 7 ILA-COPE's financial activity. 11 Shortly thereafter, on June 7, 2012, it filed the sua sponte
- 8 submission now before the Commission. 12 And on October 30, 2012, after its compliance
- 9 consultant completed its audit, ILA-COPE provided the completed audit report to OGC. 13
- The audit covered all financial activity from 2005 through 2011. 14 It began with 2005
- because that was the earliest year for which reliable bank reconciliation and other financial
- 12 records were available, despite ILA-COPE's efforts to obtain records for earlier years. 15 And
- although the audit period closed at the end of 2011, ILA-COPE provided additional worksheets
- 14 covering activity through September 30, 2012. 16

See ILA-COPE Sua Sponte Submission at 2.

*ld*, at 1-2.

<sup>9</sup> *Id*. at 1.

See Audit Findings at 1-2.

ILA-COPE Sua Sponte Submission at 2.

<sup>12</sup> Id. at 1.

See Audit Findings.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> *Id*. at 2.

See id. at 6.

<sup>16</sup> See id. at 19.

1 The audit revealed that, during that seven-year period, ILA-COPE had under-reported disbursements by \$1,338,675.57 and receipts by \$491,800.40.<sup>17</sup> The primary source of the 2 3 discrepancies in disbursements—more than \$1 million of the total—was unreported administrative expenses such as legal fees, accounting fees, and bank fees. 18 ILA-COPE also 4 found, however, that it misreported contributions to candidates and political committees. 19 As 5 6 for the discrepancy in receipts, ILA-COPE found that the primary cause was the misreporting of interest and investment income, but it also misreported uniterized contributions it received.<sup>20</sup> 7 The audit report also explains that ILA-COPE's financial discrepancies began much 8 9 earlier than 2005 and that, as of January 1, 2005, ILA-COPE already had over-reported its cash on hand by \$929,232.40.21 As a result, by the end of 2011, it also had a cumulative cash-on-10 hand discrepancy of \$1,776,107.56.<sup>22</sup> 11 12 During the course of its audit, ILA-COPE also discovered that it failed to report and keep records for independent expenditures totaling \$130,414.26. 23 According to the audit report, in 13 14 2008, ILA-COPE made two disbursements that appeared to be independent expenditures because of their "timing and the nature of the business performed by the recipient entities, namely, 15

printing and event planning."<sup>24</sup> One disbursement was to a printer, dated October 15, 2008, for

Į.

<sup>17</sup> *Id.* at 6.

<sup>18</sup> *Id.* at 11.

<sup>19</sup> *Id.* at 13-14.

<sup>20</sup> Id. at 11-12.

<sup>21</sup> *Id.* at 6.

<sup>22</sup> *Id.* at 10.

<sup>23</sup> Id. at 16.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> *Id.* at 16.

- \$21,935.14; the other was to an event planner, dated November 10, 2008, for \$108,479,12.<sup>25</sup>
- 2 ILA-COPE's auditors could not locate any documents to explain the disbursements, but they
- 3 interviewed the vendors and confirmed that they provide "politically active" products to political
- 4 organizations.<sup>26</sup> Thus, under the circumstances, ILA-COPE concluded that it should have treated
- 5 these disbursements as independent expenditures and reported them as such.<sup>27</sup>
- In its submission, ILA-COPE acknowledges that these failures constitute violations of the
- 7 Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the "Act") as well as Commission
- 8 regulations.<sup>28</sup> It concluded, however, that the particular violations at issue here were "the direct
- 9 result of incomplete or inaccurate recordkeeping along with a lack of understanding of FEC
- 10 reporting requirements."<sup>29</sup> The audit uncovered no evidence of intentional, willful misconduct.<sup>30</sup>
- The submission also describes specific corrective measures that ILA-COPE is
- implementing to prevent future violations. First, ILA-COPE's outside compliance consultant
- 13 now is reviewing and processing all political committee expenditures for signature by ILA-
- 14 COPE's treasurer. 31 Second, the consultant now carries out monthly financial reporting,
- 15 including bank reconciliations, to ensure disclosure reports are accurate before ILA-COPE

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> *Id.* 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> *Id*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> *Id*.

See id. at 6, 10-14, 16 (discussing legal standards and applying those to audit findings).

Id. at 2. For instance, in its supplemental submission, ILA-COPE explained that it failed to report the administrative expenses because its finance personnel mistakenly believed that only "political activity" was to be included and therefore never furnished the administrative expense information to the preparer of its reports. Id. at 10-11. As we discuss, ILA-COPE also noted that one of the corrective measures being implemented is training for those with responsibility for ILA-COPE's financial activity. Sae id. at 17.

<sup>30</sup> *Id.* at 2.

<sup>31</sup> Id. at 17.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

- submits them to the Commission.<sup>32</sup> Third, the consultant plans to meet with ILA-COPE's
- 2 treasurer and assistant treasurer, as well as other ILA-COPE finance staff, to provide training
- 3 regarding their obligations under the Act and Commission regulations.<sup>33</sup>

### 4 III. LEGAL ANALYSIS

The Act and Commission regulations require committee treasurers to file reports of receipts and disbursements according to the requirements of 2 U.S.C. § 434.<sup>34</sup> These reports must disclose, *inter alia*, the total amount of receipts and disbursements and the cash on hand at the beginning of the reporting period.<sup>35</sup> Committees also are required to itemize certain receipts and disbursements and disclose each person who made contributions, or provided any interest or other receipts, or received any disbursements in an aggregate amount greater than \$200 within the calendar year, together with the date and amount of any such receipt or disbursement.<sup>36</sup>

Here, ILA-COPE acknowledges that it did not comply with the Act's reporting requirements because it failed to disclose an aggregate of \$1,830,475.97 in receipts and disbursements during the seven-year audit period and had a cash-on-hand discrepancy totaling \$1,776,107.56 by the end of 2011.<sup>37</sup> Based on our review of ILA-COPE's submission, we have concluded that between July 31, 2007, and February 2, 2012—the applicable time period ht this

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>32</sup> *I.d.* 

<sup>1</sup>d. ILA-COPE also has taken steps to improve communication between ILA-COPE and an affiliated committee to avoid the potential for excessive contributions. While excessive contributions are not at issue in this matter, the fact that ILA-COPE identified an additional perceived weakness and took steps to prevent a potential future violation is noteworthy.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>34</sup> 2 U.S.C. § 434(a)(4); 11 C.F.R. § 104.1(a).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>35</sup> 2 U.S.C. § 434(b); 11 C.F.R. § 104.3.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>36</sup> 2 U.S.C. § 434(b)(3)-(6); 11 C.F.R. § 104.3(a)(4), (b)(3).

Audit Findings at 6, 10.

- case<sup>38</sup>—ILA-COPE failed to accurately disclose financial activity totaling \$1,644,347.99 (based
- 2 on disbursements totaling \$984,689.35 and receipts totaling \$659,658.64) and overstated its cash
- 3 on hand by \$516,542.39, both in violation of 2 U.S.C. § 434(b).<sup>39</sup>
- 4 The Act and Commission regulations also require committees to disclose and keep
- 5 records concerning independent expenditures. A committee must report all of its independent
- 6 expenditures on Schedule E as part of its regular reports to the Commission. 40 Additionally, If a
- 7 committee's independent expenditures aggregate to \$10,000 or more during the calendar year up
- 8 to and including the 20th day before an election, the committee must disclose the activity within
- 9 48 hours. 41 And during the 20-day window before an election, a committee must disclose within
- 10 24 hours any independent expenditure activity that aggregates to \$1,000 or more. 42 Finally,
- committees must maintain records with sufficiently detailed information so that their reports can
- 12 be verified. 43
- 13 ILA-COPE acknowledges that it did not make any of the required disclosures concerning
- 14 \$130.414.26 in independent expenditures it made in 2008.<sup>44</sup> Nor did it maintain the necessary

See 28 U.S.C. § 2462 (providing five-year limitations period beginning on date claim accrues). On July 24, 2012, ILA-COPE agreed to a 180-day tolling agreement so that it could complete its audit and supplement its sua sponte submission. And on January 24, 2013, it agreed to an additional 60 days of tolling to allow additional time for the Commission to review the proposed Conciliation Agreement.

Audit Findings at 8-10. We calculated the increase in activity by aggregating the yearly discrepancy totals for receipts and disbursements. We calculated the cash-on-hand discrepancy by taking the difference between ending cash on hand for 2011 and the beginning cash on hand for 2007.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>40</sup> 2 U.S.C. § 434(b)(6)(B)(iii), (d), (g); 11 C.F.R. §§ 104.3(b)(3)(vii), 104.4, 109.10(a).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>41</sup> 2 U.S.C. § 434(g); 11 C.F.R. § 104.4(b)(2).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>42</sup> 2 U.S.C. § 434(g); 11 C.F.R. § 104.4(c).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>43</sup> 11 C.F.R. § 104.14(b).

<sup>44</sup> Audit Findings at 16.

## Pre-MUR 542 (ILA-COPE) First General Counsel's Report Page 8 of 12

1	records concerning	these independent	expenditures.45	Thus,	based on our	review of its
---	--------------------	-------------------	-----------------	-------	--------------	---------------

- 2 submission, we conclude that ILA-COPE failed to disclose to the Commission or keep records
- 3 concerning independent expenditures totaling \$130,414.26, in violation of 2 U.S.C. § 434(b) and
- 4 (g) and 11 C.F.R. § 104.14(b).<sup>46</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>45</sup> *Id*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>46</sup> *Id*.

ı

2.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

V.	CONCLUSION	•
V -	CONCIDENT	

- 14 For the reasons discussed above, we recommend that the Commission accept the
- 15 executed Conciliation Agreement attached to this Report.

### 16 VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 17 1. Open a Matter Under Review;
- 18 2. Accept the attached Conciliation Agreement with ILA-COPE;

# Pre-MUR 542 (ILA-COPE) First General Counsel's Report Page 12 of 12

1	3.	Approve the appropriate le	etter; and
2	4.	Close the file.	
3 4			Anthony Herman General Counsel
5. 6 7 8 9	Dated:	Feb. 13, 2013	BY: Daniel A. Petalas Associate General Counsel for Enforcement  Peter G. Blumberg Assistant General Counsel
11 12			Leonard O. Evans III
13			Attorney, Enforcement Division
14 15			